



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, September 19, 2014

1:00 PM until Adjournment

DSC Ledbetter B&C

Present: **CALS**— Cheatham, He, Merrick, Street, Anson, Douglas, Ecke, Kyong-McClain, Maguire, McAbee **CB**— Funk, Mitchell, Hendon, Farewell. **CEHP**— Prince, Layton, Vander Putten, Carmack, Evans, Faust, Hayn, Thomas. **CSSC**— Giammo, Giese, Craw, Golden, Rhodes, Scranton, Jensen, Matson, Hawkins (alt). **CEIT**— Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, McMillan, Bayrak. **LIB**— Macheak **LAW**—Fitzhugh. **EX OFFICIO**— Anderson, Toro, Ford, Wright.

Absent: **CALS**— LeGrand, Seo, Amrhein. **CB**— none. **CEHP**— Jones, Kuykendal. **CSSC**— none. **CEIT**— none. **LIB**— none. **LAW**— Aiyetoro, Boles. **EX OFFICIO**— Morris, McNeill.

I. Welcome and Roll Call

President Wright called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm. Secretary McMillan called the roll.

II. Review of Minutes

The minutes of the August 29, 2014 meeting of the Senate were reviewed. Cheatham made a motion to approve the minutes as distributed and Evans seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

III. Announcements

President Wright announced that there is a deadline of “mid-October” that must be met for reporting the College Core Curriculums to the Coordinating Board. He asked that the College Cores be submitted to the Core Curriculum Council so that they may act on them. If the colleges do not have their College Core Curriculums to the Core Curriculum Council in the next week, he will call a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 10 in order to take action to meet the reporting deadline.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 min limit, no discussion)

Anson – read an email as an update on a case related to the Yellow Card late enrollment process.–

“...An update on the case this morning. We did fill in a yellow card so that this student could add the class and it was emailed to student accounts on August 25 (as per online instructions). It appears that Student Accounts took almost two weeks to act on the yellow card. Then it took a week and a half for the student to contact the instructor and to actually start the class. And that brings us up to the sudden and unexpected appearance in week 5. So a culmination of problems led to the current situation. I think it underlines just how weak and incapable of handling the students we have the current procedures are. I'm going to advise the student that they should drop the class in their own best interests and that if they choose to continue they do so at their own risk. Daryl has offered to intercede with student accounts so that the student at least gets a refund for the class. Not very satisfactory all round, but it looks like the best we are going to be able to do under the circumstances.”

Maguire – reported that she had an encounter with a transfer student this week who came to UALR with an Associate Degree. Because there is no advising for transfer students, this student is taking 2 core courses that will not help her in progress toward a degree. She is also doing poorly. We do nothing to ensure that the students will succeed. If we want to be transfer friendly, we should help our students.

V. Report

A. Chancellor's Report – Joel Anderson

Chancellor Anderson's report included remarks on enrollment and the new Associate Degree program. He reported that enrollment is down -5.6% (969 students). This translates to a \$4.5 million deficit. The hiring freeze is still in effect and there will be a 10% reduction in maintenance budgets across campus. The new Associate Degree is with Greenbrier High School. It has been approved by the Board of Trustees. It builds on our long-term concurrent enrollment program that we have had with Greenbrier High School.

Chancellor Anderson also announced that we have a faculty member elected to the LR School Board – Jim Ross.

Questions?

Rhodes asked the Chancellor to explain more about the Greenbrier program.

Chancellor Anderson said it is 60 credit hours. Greenbrier High School has hired qualified faculty to make this possible. They have been working with us closely throughout the years.

Cheatham reported that Greenbrier officials have been working toward this since before we began our concurrent enrollment partnership. They have a well-qualified faculty. They have 200 students in and out of the program. All of their concurrent enrollment students qualify for UALR enrollment (ACT scores and ACT for college math). Some of their students have been getting 40-45 hours of college credit. Greenbrier officials have become intentional to meet the core requirements for our educational core. Board Policy

and ADHE has allowed for a concurrent enrollment Associate Degree for some time. It has come to fruition now.

Sen. Giese asked are we tracking who might be coming to finish a degree at UALR?

Chancellor Anderson answered we have every opportunity to recruit these students. They are already our students. We estimate there will be a few degrees in the spring – 7-10 degrees maybe.

Jovanovic asked if it requires board actions and ADHE actions, why did it not go through the Faculty Senate?

Chancellor Anderson responded that is a fair issue. The logic is that the degree had already been approved. Issue was that the degree is done off site.

Anson asked how the faculty there are selected. In all of the concurrent things we have been dealing with, we have had the right to review and approve faculty and syllabi. I don't remember approving any faculty or syllabi in History.

Cheatham responded that every faculty member who is teaching has been vetted. No teacher was approved without being vetted. Syllabi are reviewed as well.

B. Provost's Report – Zulma Toro

Provost Toro reported on the College Core Curriculum, enrollment, Student Success, the Huron Consulting Group report, and her availability for discourse. The College Core Curriculums must be finalized and submitted by mid-October to the coordinating board so that it may be reviewed before implementation in January.

Not everything is negative about the enrollment numbers. First time freshman increased by 8.8%; High School concurrent enrollment increased by 1.8%; Graduate applications increased by 5% and graduate student enrollment increased by 18%.

A survey related to Student Success revealed the top reasons why students from last year did not return this year. Students reported that financial difficulties, specifically running out of financial aid kept them from returning. Also they may have transferred to a different institution because they were unable to make the requirements for our programs. Personal reasons were also cited. We are identifying students who are interested in returning and looking at targeted scholarships. We will be using Civitas – analytics to look at top predictors of student success and top risk areas for our students. The implementation will involve the QI (Quality Initiative) team.

She reported that the recommendations from the Huron consulting group will be offered next week to Chancellor.

She reminded all that she will be available to speak with anyone interested on any subject on the following dates: Fri. Oct. 10, 2 pm; Fri. Nov. 7, 2 pm; Fri. Dec. 1, 2 pm (meeting in the Student Success Center Auditorium).

C. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies – Belinda Blevins-Knabe

Blevins-Knabe reported that the College Core submissions information was sent out via email. The submission form is on the website. Submissions can be emailed directly to her.

Regarding the general Core Curriculum, there are courses pending from Math, one pending from Biology and one approved from Economics.

D. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

Tramel reported that the normal business of the council has been fairly light. Most of their time was in discussion about the College Core Curriculums. They are still reviewing their operating procedures.

E. Graduate Council – Kent Layton

Layton reported that they have had 19 course proposals and 21 applications for graduate faculty status. They had a report from Dean Paula Casey about the automation in the graduate admissions process. Angela Hunter visited to discuss the Huron Consulting Groups report. They had a discussion on the proposed changes to the 1st and 2nd floor of the Library. They are working on the process for compiling online data to assist with graduate degrees.

VI. Old Business

- A. Motion FS_2014_15. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. 3/5 Majority Vote at Two Meetings. Second Vote) Faculty Research (committee) name change (no second required)

Change “Faculty Research” to:

Faculty Research Committee

This committee shall make recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning research policies of a general nature and methods of encouraging research activity. Under the authority of the vice chancellor and provost, it shall award the faculty research grants. The committee shall consist of one full-time faculty member from each college and school represented in the Faculty Senate to be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Each member shall serve a two-year term, with the terms to be staggered to insure experienced representation.

Commentary: The committee which is referred to colloquially as the Faculty Research Committee does not include committee in its name, going back to the 1988 constitution.

President Wright made the motion FS_2014_15.

No discussion.

The motion was adopted.

VII. New Business

- A. Motion FS_2014_16. Pete Tschumi (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting.) (Action to be submitted to the University Assembly for ratification at two consecutive Assembly meetings.) That the section of the constitution specifying the functions of the Faculty Senate be modified as shown below to add student affairs thereby bringing the constitution into alignment with Board of Trustee Policy 100.4

Functions of the Faculty Senate

Within the framework of this Constitution, the authority of the UALR Assembly, and such governmental principles as are officially established for the University of Arkansas multicampus system, the Faculty Senate shall be, under the Board of Trustees, the legislative and advisory body on educational policies and programs on this campus. The Faculty Senate shall have the right to make recommendations on all matters that concern the educational mission and effectiveness of the University.

The areas of the Faculty Senate's legislative authority shall include but are not limited to the following:

1. Admission requirements
2. Curriculum and courses
3. Degrees and requirements for degrees
4. Calendar and schedules
5. Awards, honors and honorary degrees
6. Student affairs
7. Interpretation of its own legislation

In addition to its legislative authority and all actions taken under this authority, the Faculty Senate shall make comments and recommendations on matters of multicampus concern, directing them to the chancellor and, through the chancellor, to the president or other appropriate system-wide University authority. Similarly, the Faculty Senate shall make comments and recommendations on matters of UALR concern, directing them either to the chancellor alone or to both the chancellor and the president of the University of Arkansas, to be submitted by the president to the Board of Trustees.

Commentary: I do not know why this authority was not included in the constitution originally perhaps it was added to policy 100.4. Regardless as to why it is not there, it is one of the responsibilities of the faculty and should be included.

Tschumi – I sent out an additional line to the Faculty Executive Committee – added text to cite the policy so in the future we will know where we got this from (see below).

Functions of the Faculty Senate

Within the framework of this Constitution, the authority of the UALR Assembly, and such governmental principles as are officially established for the University of Arkansas multicampus system, the Faculty Senate shall be, under the Board of Trustees, the legislative and advisory body on educational policies

and programs on this campus. The Faculty Senate shall have the right to make recommendations on all matters that concern the educational mission and effectiveness of the University.

The areas of the Faculty Senate's legislative authority shall include but are not limited to the following list taken from Board of Trustee Policy 100.4, Chapter III, section 5.2:

1. Admission requirements
2. Curriculum and courses
3. Degrees and requirements for degrees
4. Calendar and schedules
5. Awards, honors and honorary degrees
6. Student affairs
7. Interpretation of its own legislation

In addition to its legislative authority and all actions taken under this authority, the Faculty Senate shall make comments and recommendations on matters of multicampus concern, directing them to the chancellor and, through the chancellor, to the president or other appropriate system-wide University authority. Similarly, the Faculty Senate shall make comments and recommendations on matters of UALR concern, directing them either to the chancellor alone or to both the chancellor and the president of the University of Arkansas, to be submitted by the president to the Board of Trustees.

Tschumi made the motion FS_2014_16.

Discussion-

Funk – I am not sure what this is. Can we get some detail.

Tschumi – for example we have existing legislation where we do some things for students - behavioral things in setting policy for dealing with behavior. Two groups get authority – the Chancellor and Faculty Senate. This aligns us with board policy. This will make sure we do not give up our rights.

Funk - I would like some clarity before we bite off more than we can chew.

Pres. Wright – we would have to limit ourselves if this comes under Faculty Senate responsibility.

Jovanovic – we already have this power, we are just making it clear that we have this power.

Funk – outside of the curriculum side, what are we talking about taking authority over?

Tschumi – we are stating what we already have

Funk – what more would it cover other than the academic side?

Jovanovic – does anyone have the board policy?

Pres. Wright – reads the policy (under campus governance) – campus governance organization shall develop educational programs on campus. Includes.....student affairs. This gave rise to our campus governance structure that got approved.

Tschumi – this delegates the authority. The Board gave it to the governance structure.

Faust – how did Student Affairs not get included ? Was it accidentally overlooked.

Toro –there is a big debate and long consideration of this matter. There are aspects of student affairs that require professional knowledge of those issues. It is in Faculty Senates best interest to not have to cover student affairs.

Funk – I am a department chair, beholden to the faculty, students, administration and faculty structure. If we take on additional work, I cannot take on more.

Jovanovic – This is not a complete lists of our areas of responsibility. Board policy gives us the right to be involved in student affairs.

Cheatham – my memory is that this predated the Faculty Senate. It came about as a part of the creation of the Assembly, when Dr. Anderson was President of the Assembly. Previously student affairs was in the Vice Chancellor’s office. It was moved out to a different office. We separated Vice Chancellor positions. We decided that we have the authority, we are doing grievance issues, behavioral issues already but the words were just not listed in the Constitution. We have recently re-merged these areas under one office.

Giammo – this seems like a no-brainer. We have not identified any harm that has come from leaving it out, but what are the issues? I am inclined to support the motion, but need more information.

Anson – I was the President that oversaw the Assembly Constitution. We tried to make sure it was following policy to the letter. This is a policy matter...we should not give up any of our purview. We should keep that authority. It is not the nitty gritty. We set policy

Past President Ford – I did not think it would raise a lot of discussion. I would like to move to postpone for at least one meeting, and to bring the history out.

Ford made a motion to postpone to the October 17 meeting

Prince seconded the motion.

Ayes 30

Nayes 9

Motion is postponed by show of hands to the October 17 meeting.

- B. Motion FS_2014_17. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting.) (Action to be submitted to the University Assembly for ratification at two consecutive Assembly meetings.) Term of senators (no second required)

That the section of Article III of the Constitution specifying Elections of Faculty senators be change to:

Elections of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Officers

Faculty Senate elections shall be by secret ballot, and shall be held before the end of the Spring semester of each year, the exact date to be determined by the dean of each college or school. Senators elected at these college or school meetings shall assume office at the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year in August or September.

Members shall serve two-year, staggered terms.

During the first meeting of the academic year in August or September, the Faculty Senate shall elect its officers from the membership of the Faculty Senate.

Commentary: It is assumed throughout article III that Faculty Senators serve a two year term. However, it is never explicitly stated. It is strongly implied under By-Laws: Vacancies, which states “Seats in the Faculty Senate ... that become vacant during the academic year shall be filled for the remainder of that year from a list of alternates maintained by the Executive Committee, and for the next year (if required) by special election ...” However, in governance documents, it is better to explicitly state what is intended, rather than rely on implicit interpretation.

President Wright made the motion FS_2014_17.

No discussion

Motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

- C. Motion FS_2014_19. Ad Hoc Committee on Graduation Requirements (Upper Level) (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting.) Fix the upper level requirement (second required)

Amend the 2012 Baccalaureate Degree Requirements Legislation from March 15, 2013, to reinstate the 45-hour upper-level degree requirement as a university requirement; and to revise the language about the 12 elective hours; and to revise the language about the major requirements in oral and written communication; research, ethics, and critical thinking; and technology so that it reads:

To receive a baccalaureate degree, a student must complete the following requirements:

- A minimum of 120 hours of which 30 hours must be in residence: and 45 hours must be upper-level. At least 15 upper-level hours must be completed in residence. A baccalaureate degree program may require more than 120 semester hours of college credit if prior approval has been granted by the Board of Trustees or it is a requirement of an independent licensing or accrediting body.
- Except ~~for~~ in majors that must adhere to standards established by national ac-

~~crediting agencies, majors must have a minimum of 45 hours of upper level credit, at least 12 hours of which, chosen by the student, must come from other departments; students must select at least 12 elective hours outside their program in addition to the Standard and College Core. and majors will include, as appropriate to the discipline~~

- ~~• a communication in the discipline course which covers writing and speaking;~~
- ~~• a course which covers research methods, ethics, and critical thinking; and~~
- ~~• instruction on technology within other required courses in the major~~

- Except in majors that must adhere to standards established by national accrediting agencies, major requirements must include courses or coursework either within or outside the department on
 - Oral and written communication in the discipline;
 - Research methods, ethics, and critical thinking;
 - Technology.

Commentary: The proposed revisions address the numerous problems that have been pointed out if one were to move the 45-hour UL requirement to the major. They address the confusion created in the 12-hour rule regarding departments that offer multiple programs, clarifying that these electives *can* come from the same department so long as they are not being used by the student to meet major requirements. Finally, they revise the language regarding the “skills in the major” requirement to resolve ambiguities and create parallelism.

The word “program” is chosen for the 12 elective hours instead of department or major.

The English major, for instance, has three programs: the standard track; the creative writing emphasis; and the secondary education track.

If we say that a student who is an English major taking the standard track/program must take 12 hours outside the major, that student would not be able to count the hours of a linguistic or creative writing minor towards that requirement because these classes are within the same department and major.

They are, however, not part of the program that falls under the general English track. This language would also work for the program that is the secondary education track within the English major, and it would importantly mean that a student in the creative writing emphasis track/program would not be able to minor in creative writing because it is already built in to their program.

Additionally, see Attachment X for May 9, 2014, Provisional Findings Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduation Requirements.

President Wright noted that the motion should say 'Baccalaureate Degree Requirements Upper Level.'

Ecke made motion FS_2014_19

Merrick seconded the motion.

Discussion -

Giammo – asked if all of the accredited programs are exempt. Do any programs exist that are not accredited that have the exemption?

Pres. Wright –responded that was not the charge of the committee

Jovanovic – the original legislation had an additional 12 hours of upper level required. This is a problem for Engineering because Engineering requires all kinds of hours outside of the department, but these are not upper level hours.

McMillan – noted that these changes help with the Geology degree program, which is not an accredited program

Maguire – if we pass these we will have to change our requirements

Ecke – this legislation has already been passed. Our purpose is meant to deal with the changes it would force

Maguire - did you think of advising when you looked at these?

Ecke – we did. While it is somewhat nebulous, there are some of the minors that can help with the requirements. We are looking at minors for the skills implementation as well. The minors have not disappeared. But the minor requirement has gone away. We are aware that this will impinge on advising.

Cheatham – will you be amenable to remove the word 'elective?' Finding the electives from the advising standpoint could be a problem.

Pres. Wright- if we did that, we would roll back what the previous senate passed

Jovanovic – 12 hour problem means students could take transfer hours instead of upper level – was to make students to take upper level hours from us

Ecke – We don't think the senate thought through the whole implications of the legislation

Merrick – an undergraduate student could get a degree with 21 upper level hours. Students could be put in a pickle if more upper level hours were added.

Ford – I have a different memory. The 12 hour upper level requirement in my memory was to ensure that students took more upper level courses to get a broader perspective at a junior/senior level.

Tschumi – I agree with Ford. The intent of the Faculty Senate was to maintain the 45 upper level hours. It was badly written in that section. On the 12 hours – the recommendation came from 2 directions, the humanities taskforce and the critical thinking taskforce. In higher levels of critical thinking, you need to engage in critical thinking in areas that one does not know well. We want students to take upper level courses in something different than their major program.

Anson – this gets down to the idea that we are a university. So some of what was cut from core is put back into it through the upper level requirements.

Matson – the purpose was to replace the minor. The Committee is coming forward with the change because in some disciplines it is possible to take a course that is upper level because there are no prerequisites, in others you can't take the upper level courses without the prerequisites

Tschumi – I see that concern. It would give an incentive in the sciences to build an upper level courses that would only have prerequisites of the 8 hours of core science.

Jovanovic – on the term 'elective. If a program says you have to take Physics, but it can be Physics I or Physics for Engineers – is one an elective if it is not taken as the required. It is not clear what elective means. Who decides when a student meets the requirements?

Scranton – I have a question about the 3rd part. How would I know, as a student, if a course would satisfy the skills requirement?

Ecke – that is something the committee is looking into and will bring to the Faculty Senate in the next meeting.

Ford – I am hearing a lot of support for the idea of taking some more classes outside of the major at the upper level. I am not seeing this in the motion in front of us. If that is what we really want, someone needs to make the motion to send it back to the committee.

Ecke – we have 45 upper level hours as a requirement. By many departments, that is already built into the degree program. We are trying to preserve interdisciplinarity.

Giammo – the idea was to make sure a student is branching out beyond their own major. There was concern about getting rid of the minor in the first place, a concern that students will no broaden their education. We need to deal with the programs where this is a problem.

Jovanovic – Engineering programs are accredited or attempting be accredited. This won't affect my program. So I can live with this.

Matson – I urge people to pass this. The committee will come back with implementation. The 3rd piece of this legislation will require thinking through this. We have talked about this for 2 years. The committee was trying to clarify. We need to get the wording to get this accepted and pass.

Faust – I will have to vote no because of the 12 hour upper level requirement.

Pres. Wright – we are getting to the point where we have to vote yes or no, or send it back to the committee.

Hawkins – I want to vote yes

Matson – I agree with Hawkins

Pres. Wright adjourned to a Committee of the Whole to make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate on the following questions.

Should the 12 elective hours outside of the program be upper level hours?

Ayes = 16

Nays = 18

Should some of the 12 elective hours must be upper level ?

Ayes = 11

Nays = 16

Should the 12 hours outside of the program no longer be elective?

Ayes = 16

Nays = 15

The committee of the whole rose and the Senate resumed its business.

Jovanovic made a motion to move the question, Layton seconded. The motion passed by voice vote.

The motion FS_2014_19 passed by voice vote.

- D. Motion FS_2014_20. Faculty Senate Executive Committee) (Resolution. Majority Vote at One Meeting.) Establish an official faculty email listing for official communications (no second required)

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that an email list consisting of all members of the UALR Assembly be established and maintained for purposes of official communications. The authorized posters to this list must include the chancellor, the executive vice chancellor and provost, the UALR Assembly Ex-

ecutive Committee, and all associate vice chancellors and associate vice provosts. Additional authorized posters may be added at the discretion of the chancellor, the executive vice chancellor and provost, or the president of the UALR Assembly.

Commentary: Recent events have shown that reliable communication between the leadership of the university and the members of the assembly is important for good decision making. Facfocus and other lists are not reliable communication channels as they do not cover all the university assembly and they are routinely used for non-official communications.

President Wright made the motion FS_2014_20

Discussion -

Anson – the Bulletin used to be mechanism to inform members of Faculty Assembly. FacFocus was set up to serve that purpose. It was stolen from us. We need to establish and maintain an email list for purposes of informing the members.

Matson – this is for the whole Assembly. It is not all employees. All faculty members, all staff senators, a certain number of students as designated by policy, and anyone with title of director and some specific vice chancellors are included.

Tramel – are we able to opt out.

President Wright – No

Jensen – This is an email list, not a listserv?

Pres. Wright – This is a one way communication. Only authorized posters can post to it.

Jensen – this is not a discussion list

President Wright – correct

Fitzhugh – is the law school is included?

Pres. Wright – yes, you are part of the Assembly

The motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote

VIII. Open Forum

- A. “Yellow Card” legislation parameters. This discussion will assist in setting the parameters of the legislation which should be brought in October.

President Wright opened the Open Forum reminding the Faculty Senate of the issues at start of semester relating to admissions, students getting kicked out, and students getting into class late via the yellow card process. The Senate has the authority to pass legislation to address the ‘yellow card’ issue. We need to set parameters.

Maguire – there were several ways students were admitted in any number of ways that students end up in classes at beginning of semester. I see two issues – inefficiency in the

office of admissions, and inefficiency of the student. Whatever process we allow, part of the process needs to be something that tells the student they have responsibility. A student gets added in late, the student has no responsibility, the administration has no responsibility, the faculty gets it in their DFW. Also, this sets the student up to fail.

Pres. Wright – there is an issue of communication

Jovanovic – I understand what the Senators from History are saying. But I disagree with one. There are good reasons for late policies. As an example, my daughter received a scholarship. It took from June until just this week to get the financial aid - to get it figured out. Those students with scholarships need to be able to get into classes. We need late registration policies, but we need to get the message out that late registration policies are not about starting a class late, but just registering.

McAbee – for face to face classes that works. In an online course, once a student gets removed, they can't get into the class until they are enrolled again.

Anson – students get it into their heads that they can't attend the class until they are enrolled.

Maguire – I agree – as long as they are attending they are getting the material. I was offended last meeting that these things are our fault. If it is inefficiencies at our institution, we need to fix it. We are allowing all of these inefficiencies to force policies.

Pres. Wright – we need to enable students to allow them to continue participation until their issue is resolved.

Scranton – the frame for this needs to be the good start. All literature says students must be ready for the first day of class. This needs to be a big message for student behavior.

Cheatham –there is a legal issue – letting people attend class who are not university students. I am not able to have access to information to know who is telling the truth. There is a legal issue to allow a student into a class into which they are not enrolled.

Pres. Wright – if they have met the admission standards, they are admitted to UALR, this is the next step – enrollment in a course.

Tschumi – the idea that this is coming from our policies... if it is the fault of the Faculty Senate Policy, then they need to state which policy. Which policy? Then, how would you implement the policy.

Jovanovic – we are not supposed to be letting unregistered students into class.

Daryl Rice – charges that some office has been grossly inefficient is wrong. The student has to go and arrange their enrollment problem. It is not the office of Students Account's fault for student inefficiency. What other processes are backing up so that students have to use the yellow card? We have no deadlines. We have regular, late and yellow card registration. These are arbitrary.

Craw – We need someone from the registrar, from admissions to bring information

Pres. Wright –we will invite those involved.

Craw – we need a policy to address someone coming to class who is not enrolled.

Pres. Wright – right now the students have to pay before they get into classes. But because they have outstanding balances, which might not be large, they cannot enroll.

Tschumi – have we done anything to ask other universities how they deal with this (UA)?

Pres. Wright – some places are just as bad – we can do better

Tschumi – Do they have the same problem?

Rice – what makes the process really bad is it is not exceptional anymore.

Bayrak – there are many parameters. Technology must play a role. On the technical side, can we put a flawless process in place? Flags for the Dept chair to see?

Giammo – if we can, we should be able to say we can verify that this student will be getting money from a scholarship. Can we assume the state will come through with the money?

Giese – we are assuming that they (the students) are all deadbeats

Matson – we have two different pools of students...scholarship students vs. those who have poor planning skills

Cheatham – also is it a 35 dollar problem, or a 3500 dollar problem?

Funk - who has authority to drop people? Who has authority to add people? We are talking about two different things. Financial aid should drop for non-payment.

Jovanovic – ADHE has had the scholarship for 8 semesters. This has not happened before. This experience is a new problem this semester.

Maguire – we need to introduce students to the expectations that class begins on the first day of class

Pres. Wright - does walking around a yellow card make sense?

Layton – I had to walk one around – it was not a big problem

Ecke – what about the 100 dollar fine....per class?

Pres. Wright - anyone in favor of walking a card around?

----- crickets -----

Jovanovic – there is a financial disincentive for late registration

Tramel – they will waive it if it is not the student's fault.

Cheatham – an electronic process will work – delegated to the instructor or chair to be able to put the student in classes late. We should be able to find some technique. We should be able to do it cleanly.

Ecke – is it punishment or deterrent?

Giese – monetary punishment is difficult for our population

Scranton – from a faculty point of view – when do I start class? When can I really start class? Does a student have a right to begin in the third or fourth week. If they are added in late, what are they due?

Jovanovic – we should start on day one.

Pres. Wright – There are clear issues that need to be communicated. Labs can't be set up. Work can't be made up. But, there may be categories where you can make stuff up.

Douglas – can we have same standard for whoever gets in late?

Pres. Wright – there needs to be communication.

Cheatham – is there a difference between fall and spring semester?

Pres. Wright – I think this semester was unique

Rice – The ‘Friday night massacre’ got conflated. Then UALR works had real problems. We were reactive and we paid a price for that. Real yellow cards have increased. Only about half has to do with deletes. I am trying to figure out what is going on.

Pres. Wright – what about the percentage of course gone by for late add?

Mitchell – this is unfair to our good students

Tschumi – what is the success rate of those who are added late?

Rice – I am looking at that

IX. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 pm